

The Book of Tengu: Goblins, Devils, and Buddhas in Medieval Japan

In: Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie, Vol. 13, 2002. pp. 211-226.

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Abe Yasurō, Toyosawa Nobuko. The Book of Tengu: Goblins, Devils, and Buddhas in Medieval Japan. In: Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie, Vol. 13, 2002. pp. 211-226.

doi : 10.3406/asie.2002.1184

http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/asie_0766-1177_2002_num_13_1_1184

Résumé

Cet article s'organise autour d'une lecture d'un rouleau peint médiéval intitulé Tengu zōshi (Le livre des Tengu) daté de 1296. Après avoir rappelé l'histoire complexe de la composition de ce rouleau, des relations qu'il entretient avec un autre rouleau peint portant le titre de Zegaibō emaki (Rouleau peint du moine Zegai), ainsi qu'avec divers autres fragments et versions du récit, l'article propose une analyse du contenu et de l'arrière-plan culturel ayant présidé à l'élaboration de l'œuvre. Le rouleau s'inscrit en effet dans le contexte plus général de l'époque médiévale et des affrontements entre les diverses écoles bouddhiques, celles des sept écoles de Nara, du Tendai et du Shingon, réunies sous le vocable de kenmitsu taisai (système dominant des écoles bouddhiques exotériques et ésotériques) et des nouvelles écoles apparues au début de l'époque Kamakura (1192-1333). De même, le rouleau constitue aussi un commentaire sur les relations entre l'empereur et le pouvoir des guerriers, autour, notamment de figures aussi célèbres et controversées que celles des empereurs Go-Shirakawa, Go-Toba et de l'empereur retiré Sutoku. Le rouleau est une satire des grands établissements monastiques traditionnels comme le Mont Hiei, l'Onjō-ji, le Tō-ji, le Daigo-ji, le Mont Kōya et le Tōdai-ji, dont l'augmentation du nombre de moines et de fidèles est décrite comme la prolifération d'autant de tengu. Il n'oublie pas non plus les écoles de la Terre Pure et du zen. Le constat négatif engendré par la vision mordante que déploie l'œuvre incite à resituer celle-ci parmi d'autres textes traitant de la question des forces du mal et du démoniaque comme principe. Deux textes servent de point de départ à la réflexion : le Gukanshō (Mes vues sur l'histoire) du supérieur de l'école Tendai Men (1155- 1225) composé en 1220, et le Hirasen kojiri reitaku (Les oracles des défunts sur le Mont Hira) du moine Keisei (1189-1268) qui reprend la forme du dialogue avec les tengu. La critique des mœurs des tengu, avec leur faible pour les danseuses appelées shirabyōshi, s'inscrit aussi dans un subtil discours sur les faiblesses de certains empereurs comme Go-Shirakawa. Là où Jien veut tenir à l'écart ces êtres malfaisants, à l'origine de la folie et du désordre, produit des superstitions et des ombres du cœur, Keisei, par leur truchement veut obtenir des leçons oraculaires sur le passé et les convertir. Le Livre des tengu est né des conflits internes au sein des diverses factions du bouddhisme de Kamakura. Il englobe dans sa réprobation les Anciens et les Modernes et, par les leçons qu'il prodigue tant sur le pouvoir religieux que le pouvoir laïc, il fut lu et médité par les empereurs retirés. Mais l'impact et la réception de cette satire swiftienne demeurent encore l'objet de conjectures.

THE BOOK OF TENGU: GOBLINS, DEVILS, AND BUDDHAS IN MEDIEVAL JAPAN

ABE Yasurō 阿部泰郎

Translated by TOYOSAWA Nobuko

Cet article s'organise autour d'une lecture d'un rouleau peint médiéval intitulé Tengu zōshi (Le livre des Tengu) daté de 1296. Après avoir rappelé l'histoire complexe de la composition de ce rouleau, des relations qu'il entretient avec un autre rouleau peint portant le titre de Zegaibō emaki (Rouleau peint du moine Zegai), ainsi qu'avec divers autres fragments et versions du récit, l'article propose une analyse du contenu et de l'arrière-plan culturel ayant présidé à l'élaboration de l'œuvre. Le rouleau s'inscrit en effet dans le contexte plus général de l'époque médiévale et des affrontements entre les diverses écoles bouddhiques, celles des sept écoles de Nara, du Tendai et du Shingon, réunies sous le vocable de kenmitsu taisei (système dominant des écoles bouddhiques exotériques et ésotériques) et des nouvelles écoles apparues au début de l'époque Kamakura (1192-1333). De même, le rouleau constitue aussi un commentaire sur les relations entre l'empereur et le pouvoir des guerriers, autour, notamment de figures aussi célèbres et controversées que celles des empereurs Go-Shirakawa, Go-Toba et de l'empereur retiré Sutoku. Le rouleau est une satire des grands établissements monastiques traditionnels comme le Mont Hiei, l'Onjō-ji, le Tō-ji, le Daigo-ji, le Mont Kōya et le Tōdai-ji, dont l'augmentation du nombre de moines et de fidèles est décrite comme la prolifération d'autant de tengu. Il n'oublie pas non plus les écoles de la Terre Pure et du zen. Le constat négatif engendré par la vision mordante que déploie l'œuvre incite à resituer celle-ci parmi d'autres textes traitant de la question des forces du mal et du démoniaque comme principe. Deux textes servent de point de départ à la réflexion : le Gukanshō (Mes vues sur l'histoire) du supérieur de l'école Tendai Jien (1155-1225) composé en 1220, et le Hirasano kojō reitaku (Les oracles des défunts sur le Mont Hira) du moine Keisei (1189-1268) qui reprend la forme du dialogue avec les tengu. La critique des mœurs des tengu, avec leur faible pour les danseuses appelées shirabyōshi, s'inscrit aussi dans un subtil discours sur les faiblesses de certains empereurs comme Go-Shirakawa. Là où Jien veut tenir à l'écart ces êtres malfaisants, à l'origine de la folie et du désordre, produit des superstitions et des ombres du cœur, Keisei, par leur truchement veut obtenir des leçons oraculaires sur le passé et les convertir. Le Livre des tengu est né des conflits internes au sein des diverses factions du bouddhisme de Kamakura. Il englobe dans sa réprobation les Anciens et les Modernes et, par les leçons qu'il prodigue tant sur le pouvoir religieux que le pouvoir laïc, il fut lu et médité par les empereurs retirés. Mais l'impact et la réception de cette satire swiftienne demeurent encore l'objet de conjectures.

I. Various Problems of *Tengu zōshi*

The *e-maki* 繪巻 or picture-scroll called *Tengu zōshi* 天狗草紙 (Book of *Tengu*) is an interesting work that portrays vividly Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines, as well as the activities of the Buddhist monks and the laity during the Kamakura period. In addition, the artist's brush depicts features of religious practitioners of the medieval era, such as Ippen 一遍 (1239-1289) and the Amidist holy man Jinen koji 自然居士 (late Kamakura era). Most of all, the *e-maki* excels insofar as it reflects the figural shadows of Buddhism and reveals the existence of *Tengu*, which are sometimes referred to as goblins or demonic creatures. Through the illustrations and words in the *e-maki*, the "Book of *Tengu*" attempts to shed light on *Tengu*, which mainly operate in that shadowy territory.

Tengu seem to have played the most active and attractive role in the world of the medieval didactic tale. They appear in *Konjaku monogatari shū* 今昔物語集¹ (Tales of Times Now Past), which was composed during the *Insei* 院政 era (era of cloistered sovereigns), and display traits such as resistance against the authority of Buddhist teachings and defiance of royal authority. One of these stories was later transformed into an *e-maki* called *Zegaibō e-maki* 是害房繪巻, which was introduced to Buddhist temples. However, the *Zegaibō e-maki* failed to sufficiently lay the foundation for the establishment of *Tengu* as masters of the Realm of Devils (*makai* 魔界), a peculiar territorial concept that existed in the medieval era. It was the *Tengu zōshi* that thematized the existence of the Realm of Devils and, in that context, through the figure of the *Tengu*, signified the category of evil.

Nevertheless, *Tengu zōshi* is difficult and riddling. It is not known who Jakusen shōnin (late Kamakura era) was, whose name is mentioned in *Ainōshō* 塙囊抄.² It is further difficult to identify the claims or intentions in the text. Moreover, the *e-maki* is a complex text, and thus it is not easy to analyze each essential part and interpret them; the mystery remains regarding the way in which this *e-maki* reflects the social and historical circumstances of its composition.³ However, in this study, rather than attempting to untangle this historical mystery, I would like to analyze the "Book of *Tengu*" from various perspectives to ascertain the background for its production.

Early on, Umezu Jirō conducted groundbreaking research on the "Book of

¹ *Konjaku monogatari shū* was written in 1107 (Kajō 2). *Tengu* appear in fascicle 20.

² Jakusen shōnin 寂仙上人 (Henyū 遍融) from Yasaka is mentioned in fascicle 8 in *Ainōshō*, which was written by Gyōyo 行養 (fl. mid-15th C) in 1446 (Bun'an 3, 5) about the mid-Muromachi Period. Jakusen has supposedly written *Shichi Tengu e* 七天狗繪, (Seven *Tengu* Illustrations) as well.

³ The "Book of *Tengu*" was composed in 1296 (Einin 4). The details that brought the composition, the group that produced it, and their intentions are crucial because in the case of a text such as a picture-scroll, authorship is not the sole issue to be addressed—rather, there exists a comprehensive, systematic organization that was involved in its composition. In other words, its production has political and ideological implications.

Tengu” and introduced many source materials.⁴ Based on his achievements, a body of research has gradually been accumulated in the field of art history.⁵ In addition, in recent years scholars in the field of medieval history have begun to devote attention to the “Book of Tengu.” Moreover, this has especially been the case in the field of religious studies and social history, in which Buddhist temples and the status system have been analyzed. The origin goes back to Amino Yoshihiko, who discussed the “Book of Tengu” in his work *Mōko Shūrai* (Mongol Invasion).⁶ Furthermore, in the study of the history of Buddhism, in particular work by the Zen scholar, Harada Masatoshi,⁷ as well as that of the intellectual historian of religion, Wakabayashi Haruko,⁸ the entire picture-scroll of the “Book of Tengu,” has been examined. In addition, recently, at Kanazawa bunko archives, Takahashi Shūei has discovered the oldest manuscript of the “Book of Tengu.”⁹ Takahashi introduced four quires of the *Shoji Kaikō* 諸寺開興 (Founding of Buddhist Temples) written by the monk Ken’a (1261-1338), a monk of Shōmyōji 稱名寺 (Kanazawa bunko 金沢文庫).¹⁰ One of the quires’ original titles read “Seven Tengu [Illustrations],” which is identical with that written by Jakusen in *Ainōshō*, noted above. Therefore, *Shoji Kaikō* indicates that the “Book of Tengu” was first titled “Seven Tengu [Illustrations].”

Comparing and contrasting the *e-maki*’s words and illustrations with

⁴ Umezu Jirō 梅津次郎, “Tengu zōshi kōsatsu 天狗草紙考察,” *Bijutsu kenkyū* 美術研究 50 (1936); *Bijutsu kenkyū* 74 (1938), “Mabutsu ichinyo e-kotoba kō 魔仏一如絵詞考,” *Bijutsu kenkyū* 123 (1942) (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1972).

⁵ Amino recognized that the “Book of Tengu” foresaw that the fourteenth century would become a major transitional point in Japan’s culture and history. See, for example, Umezu Jirō, “Tengu zōshi ni tsuite 天狗草紙について,” *Shinshū Nihon e-makimono zenshū* 新修日本絵巻全集 27 (Tokyo: Kadokawa shoten, 1978); Ueno Kenji 上野憲示, “Tengu zōshi kōsatsu 天狗草紙考察,” *Zoku Nihon e-maki taisei* 続日本絵巻大成 19 (Tokyo: 1984).

⁶ Amino Yoshihiko 網野善彦, *Mōko shūrai* 蒙古襲来 (Tokyo: Shōgakkan); *Nihon no rekishi* 日本の歴史 10 (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1974; Library Version, 1992).

⁷ Harada Masatoshi 原田正俊, “Tengu zōshi ni miru Kamakura jidai no buppō 天狗草紙にみる鎌倉時代の仏法,” *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史学研究 37 (1994); id., *Nihon chūsei no zenshū to shakai* 日本中世の禅宗と社会 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1998).

⁸ Wakabayashi Haruko 若林晴子 examined the existence of *ma* or evil, and Tengu in “Tengu zōshi ni miru Kamakura jidai no ma to tengu 天狗草紙にみる鎌倉時代の魔と天狗,” in Fujiwara Yoshiaki 藤原良章 and Gomi Fumihiko 五味文彦, ed., *E-maki ni chūsei wo yomu* 絵巻に中世を読む (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1995).

⁹ Takahashi Shūei 高橋秀栄, “Shinshutsu shiryō: e-makimono Tengu zōshi no kotoba gaki 新出資料・絵巻物天狗草紙の詞書,” *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究紀要 56 (1998). “Enryakuji” quire is already introduced in *Shōmyōji no shin bakken shiryō* 稱名寺の新発見資料 (Kanagawa: Kanazawa bunko, 1994).

¹⁰ He was the second senior priest at Shōmyōji, and in the four quires of the *Shoji Kaikō*, it contains the 2 quires, in which each has exterior title to the text and internal title called “Seven Tengu [Illustrations].” The existing four quires include the “Kōfukuji/Tōdaiji” quire; the “Onjōji” quire; the “Enryakuji” quire, in which the validity of the title remains questionable; and “Tōji” quire, in which the validity of the title is more questionable than the “Enryakuji” quire.

Ken's text, we can make several insightful observations. First of all, in both works, words accompany the illustrations. Throughout the "Book of Tengu"—although each fascicle has slight distinctions—there are numerous insertions of words in the illustrations. At the end of the "Onjōji 園城寺" and "Enryakuji 延暦寺" quires of Ken's manuscript there are sentences that appear different to the main text but which are identical with so-called "words-in-illustrations" (*gachūshi* 画中詞).¹¹ Thus Ken's manuscript, which does not contain any illustrations, has *gachūshi*, indicating that this was a text originally made to have words together with illustrations, as in *e-maki*. Second, there is a limit to comprehensive comparison of Ken's manuscript and the *e-maki* "Book of Tengu." Each text of *e-maki* shares a similar framework, constituting a common structure. Thus, although differences exist, many similarities are found in Ken's "Onjōji" quire, "Enryakuji" quire, and the *e-maki*. On the other hand, the "Tōji 東寺" quire differs significantly from the *e-maki*, especially in its first half. Moreover, in the extant Ken's manuscript, we can only verify five fascicles about Buddhist temples that are the same as in the *e-maki*, and only the three fascicles of "Onjōji," "Enryakuji," and "Tōji" of the *e-maki* are compatible.¹² Third, the fact that only the "Tōji" quire is substantially different from the "Tōji" fascicle of the *e-maki* makes clear the unrivalled coherence and tight organization of Ken's manuscript. The manuscript has the same structures and descriptions as those expressed in the *e-maki*, e.g. the "Kōfukuji 興福寺" and "Tōdaiji 東大寺" fascicles.

Comparison of the *e-maki* and Ken's manuscript clarifies the elements they have in common. They both start with the construction of Buddhist temples by the wish of the emperor; list the founders of a religious sects, who became devout believers in Buddhism; honor the virtue and influence of successive high Buddhist priests and their miraculous virtue; and praise the Buddhist temples' virtue that enabled such exemplary religious deeds. Then the two texts move onto auspicious Buddhist rituals and rites for tutelary deities. After these descriptions, the texts always end with a final remark about the monks, who reside in temples, develop "arrogance" and become *Tengu* as a result of indulging in vanity. This conclusion is seen even in the *e-maki*'s "Tōji" fascicle which, as we noted, contains the most variations.

Makino Atsushi has pointed out a very interesting phenomenon through comparing the "Enryakuji" fascicle of the "Book of Tengu" with Ken's "Enryakuji" quire.¹³ Makino emphasized that the Enkyō 延慶 (1308-1311) period version of *Heike monogatari* (The Tale of Heike) has long descriptions of

¹¹ There are slight differences shown in respective quires. For example, "Onjōji" quire includes some words that are not found in the *e-maki*, but "Enryakuji" quire has only one word that is not found in the *e-maki*.

¹² Furthermore, it is not known whether *Den-Miidera* fascicle was transcribed or not.

¹³ Makino Atsushi 牧野淳司, "*Tengu zōshi* Enryakuji kan no shomondai – Enkyōbon *Heike monogatari* Enryakuji engi no kōsatsu ni oyobu" 天狗草紙延暦寺巻の諸問題-延慶本平家物語延暦寺縁起の考察に及ぶ," *Kanazawa bunko kenkyū* 金沢文庫研究 304 ((Kanagawa: Kanazawa bunko, 2000).

Mount Hiei and that the structure of these descriptions strongly resemble the words in the “Enryakuji” fascicle of the “Book of Tengu.” This example of extreme similarity may further suggest the universality of the common elements in the fascicles on Buddhist temples of the “Book of Tengu.”

Moreover, such similarity sheds light on another record called *Tengu mondō* 天狗問答 (The Dialogue of *Tengu*),¹⁴ an account in *Heike monogatari* concerning Mt. Hiei. According to the work, the monks of Mt. Hiei opposed the esoteric initiation (*Kanjō nyūdan* 灌頂入壇) of cloistered emperor Go-Shirakawa 後白河法皇 (1127-1192; r. 1155-1158) at Miidera (Onjōji) temple. Engaged in deliberations, the monks were ready to burn the temple if necessary. Go-Shirakawa was forced to cancel the esoteric initiation; at the same time, his mortification and grief was indescribable, so he initially decided to take merciless action against them for hindering Buddhism and disobeying the “royal law” (*ōbō* 王法). However, he soon reconsidered his decision and wished to seclude himself from the world. At that point, the deity Sumiyoshi myōjin (Kaihotsugen dayū) emerged and started a dialogue with Go-Shirakawa. On this occasion, the emperor acknowledged the existence of devils (*ma* 魔) and their realm which hinder both royal law and Buddhist law (*ōbō*, *buppō* 佛法)..

Sumiyoshi myōjin spoke of three kinds of devil (*ma*). The first, *Tenma* 天魔, or the devil king, is the transformed body of Buddhist priests at Mt. Hiei, who were presumably men of wisdom and masters of learning. They became extremely arrogant and their minds heretical. As the deity says, “All men of wisdom in the eight sects became *Tenma*, and now they are known as *Tengu*”; thus all the *kenmitsu* 顯密 (i.e., the six Nara schools and two Heian schools of Tendai and Shingon) priests who were supposed to defend the royal law became *Tengu*. Furthermore, others, such as clerics of Pure Land Buddhism were sucked into the Realm of Devils and disappeared. In this way, Sumiyoshi explained the definition of *ma* and *Tengu*, indicating that the cloistered emperor himself had an arrogant mind insofar as he believed that his religious training was superior to others. Consequently, the emperor was prone to attract the influence of *ma*, and was therefore himself ultimately nothing but a devil (*ma*). In this manner, the cloistered emperor realized the demon within him, and then he chanted *namu Amida Butsu* for salvation. Sumiyoshi sent him a message that came from Dengyō Daishi 傳教大師 (Saichō 最澄: 767-822) and directed him to go and receive esoteric initiation at Tennōji, known as the first site of the Buddhist law in Japanese history.

The relationship depicted here between Go-Shirakawa and *Tengu* evokes multi-layered questions: the emperor-devil relation penetrates the core of royal law-Buddhist law, and furthermore, the relationship can determine the future of and possible decline of royal law and Buddhist law. This recognition of the

¹⁴ Kataoka Takaaki 潟岡孝昭, “Shin shiryō *Tengu zōshi* to *Heike monogatari* tonokan-kei 新資料天狗草紙と平家物語との関係,” *Ōtani gakuhō* 大谷学報, vol. 39:2, 39:4 (1959, 1960). The “Book of Tengu” that is introduced here was distributed separately but contains identical parts in Enkyō Version of *Heike monogatari*.

Tengu as evil is repeatedly emphasized in the introductory part, as well as other parts in the “Book of Tengu,” in which the decline of the Buddhist law originates from the arrogance and obstinacy of monks at large temples. At the same time, as noted above, we should bear in mind that the Enkyō period version of *Heike monogatari* aimed to criticize the royal law and to make the cloistered emperor realize the origin of the decline of Buddhist law.

II. Interpretive Reading of *Tengu zōshi*

Let us read the preface and determine the problems raised there in order to understand the main theme of the “Book of Tengu” and to ascertain the world it governs. Thus we will examine images of *Tengu* based on the analysis of the latter half of the “[Presumably] Transmitted by Miidera” (Den-Miidera 伝三井寺) fascicle¹⁵; the signification of those images; and the purposes for which the images were created.

The preface can be divided into roughly four parts. The first part discusses the manner in which the Buddhist law was introduced to Japan following its movement from India to China.¹⁶ Referring to passages in *Kōninkyaku* 弘仁格 (Miscellaneous Documents of the Kōnin Era) and *Engikyaku* 延喜格 (Miscellaneous Documents of the Engi Era), it argues that successive emperors wished to build Buddhist temples since ancient times, and that the core of Buddhist law consisted of *dhāraṇī* (spells) and *śamatha* (meditation) performed by clerics for the good fortune of the imperial court.¹⁷ Furthermore, it evokes memories of the great masters’ transmission of the Buddhist law, and praises the wise and ethical holy men (*seijin* 聖人) of Japan as figures comparable to those who came before them. It presents the premise that the Buddhist law in Japan was firmly established in the form of state Buddhism under the *ritsuryō* 律令 order, and that this Buddhist law was thus superior to all others. At the same time, it also stresses that many of those who learn the true dharma (*shōbō* 正法) fall into heretical views. Thus in spite of the fact that various “Buddhist temples and mountains” were created through the vows of emperors, and none stands superior, they tend to think that they are better than the others. In the same fashion, the descendants in their respective lineages were inclined to increase their egoistic attachment. These *kenmitsu* scholars as well as the Zen monks of Nara and Kyōto were motivated only by the interest to be invited to perform public rituals on behalf of the imperial court, so their participation in clerical debates essentially ran counter to the long cherished objective of Buddhism—the purpose of Śākyamuni in his action of renunciation.

¹⁵ This section overlaps with *Mabutsu ichinyo e-kotoba*.

¹⁶ It states that at the time of Wu dynasty (222-280), only Japan was the country where *buppō* prevailed. It said, “The Buddhist *dharma* that has been accepted by the three countries came to stay only in the country (*kuni*) of Toyoashihara.”

¹⁷ Ancient times (*kodai*), in the case of Japan, usually refers to the Yamato and Nara eras. Sometimes it refers to the time until 645.

On the other hand, the account also mentions in a regrettable manner that “hermit monks of the mulberry gate” (*sōmon no inryo* 桑門ノ隱侶), who are supposed to be retired, have also become arrogant and developed strong egoistic attachments; in doing so, they have fallen prey to wrong ideas that have led them to drift from the path to *bodhi*—hence, wise monks have exposed their shameful condition. The account concludes with a remark that such clerics are the assistant monks of the heterodox path of the Demon King (*Tenma*). (In the second part, the author indicates his recognition of the contemporary state of the Buddhist law. Here, the account enumerates the vices that Buddhists fall into and laments present-day conditions that run counter to Buddhist teachings.)

In the third part, the author’s intentions are stated: “I drew pictures expressing the seven kinds of *Tengu*, and demonstrated the varied forms of human attachment.” By illustrating the figure of *Tengu* through the form of seven fascicles of *e-maki*, the work attempts to articulate the diverse forms of arrogance that constituted the condition of corrupt monks. We can note, moreover, that, following modest remarks, the author records the date of production of the “Book of Tengu”: “Eijin 4 (year 1296), a day in early winter in the tenth month.”

The last part of the preface also mentions devils (*ma*), presenting the general rule that “karmic retribution of the Realm of Devils has its ultimate source in arrogance and is cultivated through music.” It specifies the seven modes of arrogance to which the seven kinds of *Tengu* correspond, and gives as concrete examples the seven kinds of monks of Kōfukuji, Tōdaiji, Enryakuji, Miidera (Onjōji), and Tōji, together with mountain ascetics (*yamabushi* 山伏) and recluse-monks (*tonsei[sha]* 遁世[者]). Furthermore, it concludes that everything resides within egoistic attachment, and that the monks in their arrogance always think first of their own fame; therefore, they will soon fall into the Realm of Devils. It is clear that the assumed objects of this *e-maki* are the Realm of Devils and *Tengu* who operate there.

As suggested in the preface, there was a recognition that all contemporary Buddhist priests have become subject to the Realm of Devils. Based on this premise, this study will proceed to explore the actual state of the seven kinds of *Tengu*, the contemporary world of monks of the temples and schools of Buddhism, as well as their respective roles in their environs.

The descriptions in the fascicles from “Kōfukuji” to “Tōji” proceed through the use of a common structure. These temples include the four great temples of Nara (Kōfukuji, Tōdaiji), Mt. Hiei (Enryakuji = Hokurei), and Miidera (Onjōji = Jimon) as well as the Shingon temples Tōji, Ninnaji, and Daigoji—all constructed through vows of emperors and founded by the patriarch of each Buddhist school. The work stresses that virtuous monks of previous generations improved those temples, and they performed rituals for protection of the state; thus, the temples were praised as spiritual sites protected by tutelary deities. However, the end of the fascicle concludes that all of the monks who resided in such glorious temples became *Tengu* because they indulged themselves and became too arrogant. The fifth fascicle, which is

the first half of the *e-maki*, reconstructs the legends (*engi* 縁起) of the temples and reaffirms how the Buddhist law at the time of the Wu dynasty (222-280) came under the power of *ma*.

III. A Spiritual History of *Tengu zōshi*

In order to consider the historical background of the “Book of Tengu” we must explore the conditions that brought *Tengu* to be the theme of *e-maki*. We must also search for speculations and expressions that were embraced at that time and thus created the image of the Realm of Devils. These notions emerged within the realm of Buddhism, which was, after all, the matrix of “devils” (*ma*). The first text that comes to mind is *Gukanshō* 愚管抄 [My Foolish Views of History], written by great archbishop Jien 慈円 (1155-1225). Standing at the apex of the Buddhist world at the beginning of the medieval era, Jien struggled throughout his life, facing the tumultuous changes of the time. In *Gukanshō* (fascicle 6), the discussion on *Tengu* and devils emerges in a context in which Go-Shirakawa and Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212) are subjected to criticism. It mentions the death of Go-Shirakawa, an ascetic devotee of esoteric Buddhism and a so-called upholder of the Lotus Sūtra (*hokke jikyōsha* 法華持經者) and notes that the cloistered emperor especially adored arts such as dancing and *sarugaku*. The fascicle also mentions Mongaku 文覺, a fund-raising monk who Minamoto no Yoritomo (1147-1199) employed for re-construction at Tōji that was dedicated to the memorialization (*tsuizen* 追善) of Go-Shirakawa. Mongaku is described here as “a person with ascetic training but without knowledge, who denounced and spoke ill of others—and worshipped *Tengu*.”¹⁸

Shortly after this description, there is mention of an incident following the death of Go-Shirakawa in which his surviving servants attempted to cause confusion through attributing an oracle (*reitaku* 靈託) to his spirit. There had previously been oracles, one by Kanenaka in 1196 (Kenkyō 7) and another by Nakakuni in 1206 (Ken’ei 1), but they were not real. With regard to these staged oracles, Jien queries, “Isn’t it that a fox (*yakan* 野干) or *Tengu* possessed others, and were able to make people believe such oracles?” Jien claims that it is not worth believing them insofar as they were created by the uneducated, low-birth religious entertainers who surrounded Go-Shirakawa, and concludes that such were rooted in the influence of foxes (*yakan*) and *Tengu*, manifested in vulgar spirits that took advantage of social instability.¹⁹ Jien argues that Go-

¹⁸ This description implies something about the relationship between Mongaku and Go-Shirakawa. Once Mongaku was exiled to Izu after he visited the cloistered emperor’s Hōjūji residence. On this occasion, Mongaku rudely demanded the emperor’s donation for the reconstruction of Takao Jingoji temple. After he was allowed to come back, again he visited the cloistered emperor at the residence of Rengeō’in, and this time, the emperor agreed to give the donation. In this description, the retired emperor is portrayed to have no direct connection with *Tengu*. See also Abe Yasurō, *Seija no suisan* 聖者の推参 (Nagoya: Nagoya daigaku shuppankai, 2001).

¹⁹ We might also note that in stressing that the oracle was produced by the people of

Shirakawa, unlike cloistered emperor Sutoku 崇徳天皇 (1119-1164; r. 1123-1141), did not become a restless spirit following his death; these oracles, rather, were the results of the machinations of *Tengu* or foxes. For this reason, Jien concludes that the oracles were essentially harmless.

Jien goes on to make his central claims through his description of the Pure Land monk Hōnen, who was exiled by the cloistered emperor Go-Toba (1180-1239; r. 1183-1196) in 1207 (Ken'ei 2). Hōnen established the *Nenbutsu* 念佛 school (*Nenbutsu shū* 念佛宗) and preached the doctrine of *senju nenbutsu* 専修念佛 (single-practice *nenbutsu*). Preaching the benefits of *nenbutsu* for both genders, he also appealed especially to women and came to prosper quickly. When his disciples Anraku and Jūren were put to death in 1207, Hōnen was exiled. Jien describes how Hōnen came back to the capital, but here he indicates that Hōnen seems not to have achieved birth in the Pure Land (*ōjō* 往生) following his death.²⁰ Later, after the single practice *nenbutsu* (*senju nenbutsu*) associated meat-eating and adultery were stopped, monks at Mt. Hiei abolished Kūa's 空阿 (1155-1228) *nenbutsu* practice, and Chōgen 重源 (1121-1206), a fund-raising monk (*hijiri* 聖), became the first to use the name *Amida* as a part of his title—and was thus referred to as “*Namu amida butsu*.” Moreover, from there, Jien once again rehearses an incident that was caused by Hōnen's disciples. In doing so, Jien judges these events as demonstrating that “Truly, these constitute without doubt the extinction of the Buddhist law.” In his conclusion, Jien recognizes Hōnen as a hindering devil (*junma* 順魔)—a demon in charge of one side of two dimensions of *ma*.²¹ Hōnen's *senju nenbutsu*, therefore, works as nothing but a beckoning for *ma*, pulling *nenbutsu* practitioners into the Realm of Devils. In this manner, Jien justifies Go-Shirakawa's 後白河 severe suppression of scandals among ladies-in-waiting (associated with *senju nenbutsu* practices). These descriptions clearly reveal how *Tengu*, which haunted those around Go-Shirakawa, and demons—identified with Hōnen—are interrelated and overlap.

Jien's became the classic statement of the position of *kenmitsu* Buddhism, which situates the doings of *Tengu* as expressing the teaching of devils (*ma*). The focal point between Go-Shirakawa and Hōnen, an emperor and a *hijiri*, is transformed into *Tengu*'s role as the embodiment of the teaching of *ma*. At the same time, Jien criticizes Go-Shirakawa, who let *Tengu* have their own way, and views with contempt religious entertainers (*shūkyō geinōsha* 宗教芸能者) who

low rank who surrounded Go-Shirakawa, Jien defends the emperor by blaming the incident on them instead.

²⁰ Jien writes that when Hōnen returned to the capital, “even though people gathered around and repeatedly screamed ‘*ōjō* 往生’ (rebirth!) nothing convincing was noticed.”

²¹ In the process of the oppression of the *senju nenbutsu* that took place during the Ken'ei era, various sects of *kenmitsu* Buddhism criticized it, labeling Hōnen as evil. See Taira Masayuki 平雅行, “Ken'ei no Hōnan ni tsuite 建永の法難について,” in Kishi Toshio Kyōju taikan kinenkai 岸俊男教授退官記念会, ed., *Nihon seiji shakaishi kenkyū* 日本政治社会史研究, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Hanawa shobō, 1985); Taira Masayuki, *Nihon chūsei no shakai to bukkyō* 日本中世と社会と仏教 (Tokyo: Hanawa shobō, 1992).

surround the emperor. On the other hand, Jien affirms the actions of the emperor because he was able to remove monks that fell into heterodoxy—a view based on Jien’s historical interpretation of vengeful spirits (*onryō* 怨靈). Considering the violence of his era, Jien thinks that “this certainly is not a provocation of [*Hachiman*] *Daibosatsu*, but I really wonder if it is the doings of *Tengu* or foxes (*chikurui* 畜類)?” From a retrospective standpoint, he affirms the “principle that from ancient times vengeful spirits are lost to this world and cause the deaths of people.” Thus, Jien situates the vengeful spirits of Sutoku and Chisoku’in 知足院 (Fujiwara no Tadazane 藤原忠実, 1078-1162) as the ones that have to be appeased. This is what he has been confronting, but it finally emerges in the form of the relationship between *Tengu* and *ma*. Thus, one can say that Jien was the first person to recognize and situate the existence of *Tengu* and *ma* within the relationship between the royal law and Buddhist law that constituted the core image of the world in the medieval era.

A recluse-monk, Keisei 慶政 (d. 1267), like Jien a member of the Kujō lineage of the Fujiwaras, was also a person who recognized the connection between *Tengu* and *ma*, and was attuned to their voices. Keisei belonged to the *Jimon* 寺門 (Onjōji) faction of the Tendai school and lived at Hokkesanji in Nishiyama. When Jien judged Go-Shirakawa’s oracle to be false, Keisei paid close attention to one of the stories he heard; according to the story, when his brother, Michiie (1193-1252), fell ill in 1239 (En’ō 1), one of the court ladies was haunted by *Tengu*. Keisei was the author of *Hirasan Kojin Reitaku* 比良山古人霊託 (Oracle of People of Old of Hirasan), in which he recorded a dialogue with *Tengu* that resided in Mt. Hira and claimed to be a relative of Fujiwara no Kamatari (614-669). This is a vivid document that depicts *Tengu* and the Realm of Devils.²²

What Keisei understood as the image of *Tengu* has much in common with the “Book of *Tengu*.” Based on this fact, studies by Harada²³ and Wakabayashi²⁴ argue that it is possible that Keisei’s recognition of the connection between *Tengu* and the Realm of Devils as well as his ideas were reflected in the “Book of *Tengu*.” Furthermore, the “Book of *Tengu*” was possibly composed by someone of the *Jimon* faction. In the following, I will analyze anew the descriptions in *Hirasan Kojin Reitaku*, as well as the hypotheses posed by the two scholars above.

The focus of the first question that Keisei asked the *Tengu* regarded the numinous spiritual entity that haunted Michiie—in particular, the issue of whose vengeful spirit was working behind it. Starting with the name of cloistered emperor Sutoku, names of virtuous monks of Tendai and previous generations of the Kujō family were mentioned. Then, Keisei, in an effort to

²² Kinoshita Motoichi 木下資一, ed., “Hirasan kojīn reitaku 比良山古人霊託,” in *Hōbutsu shū* 宝物集/ *Kankyō no tomo* 閑居友/ *Hirasan kojīn reitaku* 比良山古人霊託, *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 新日本古典文学大系 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1993).

²³ Harada, “*Tengu zōshi ni miru Kamakura jidai kōki no buppō*.”

²⁴ Wakabayashi, “*Tengu zōshi ni miru Kamakura bukyō no ma to tengu*.”

make sure whether or not those noted had fallen into the Realm of Devils, asked the *Tengu* to which world those people went following their deaths. Keisei was especially concerned about the vengeful spirit of cloistered emperor Go-Toba 後鳥羽 who died in Oki where he was exiled in the spring of that year:

Question: In the sixth month of the year, the spirit of cloistered emperor Go-Toba invoked in prayer the deity Kumano Gongen. There was civil strife in the capital in the sixth month. Since this brought grief to the court, including many members of the imperial family, at least one story says that it was Go-Toba's spirit. How is it actually the case?

Answer: It may be that his spirit invoked the deity Kumano Gongen in prayer.

Keisei carefully avoided mentioning it directly, but the possibility that Go-Toba had transformed into a vengeful spirit was not only the concern of Michiie, but also of the imperial court and the *bakufu* 幕府 in Kantō 関東 where Michiie's son, Yoritsune (1218-1256), resided as shōgun. Go-Toba's vengeful spirit would be feared more than that of Sutoku because it would potentially have a profound influence on the future of the realm. The reason Keisei asked the *Tengu* the life-span of Michiie's political rivals, as well as the question regarding the righteousness of those governing, is due to just such a fear.

From there, the account enumerates the names of other monks and laymen who fell into the Realm of Devils.²⁵ In the dialogue, *Tengu* told Keisei that Go-Shirakawa held great power in the Realm of Devils, and that the illustrious monks of the Sanmon and Jimon Ryōgen 良源 (912-985), Yokei 余慶 (919-991), Zōyo 増誉 (1032-1116), and Ryūmei 隆明 (1065-1104) had, instead of attaining enlightenment, become powerful in the Realm of Devils. Indeed, the *Tengu* revealed that Jien resided in Mt. Atago as the most influential of the *Tengu*, and was considered the head of the Realm of Devils. Considering what was said in *Gukanshō*, this is very ironic: cloistered emperor Go-Shirakawa and Jien had now become *Tengu*, and were presented as manifesting figural shadows (*inga* 陰画/*nega*) of the royal law and Buddhist law in the Realm of Devils.

On the other hand, Keisei asked about the world after the death of the recluse Myōe 明恵 (1173-1232) and Jōkei 貞慶 (1155-1213) who had close interactions with Keisei when they were alive. The *Tengu* told Keisei that Myōe was reborn into Maitreya's inner chamber of Tuṣita heaven; on the other hand, the *Tengu* did not know about the scholar-monk Jōkei and thus did not answer the question. However, the *Tengu*'s ignorance is ironic, considering Jōkei's work *Makai ekōhōgo* 魔界廻向法語 (Dharma Talk on Transferring the Merit to the Realm of Devils) in *Keiran jūyō shū* 溪嵐拾葉集 (Collected Gleanings on Tempests and Valleys), which was a prayer for rescuing those who fell into the Realm of Devils.

²⁵ Kubota Jun 久保田淳, "Makai ni ochita hitobito – Hirasano kojiri reitaku to sono shūhen 魔界に落ちた人々 – 『比良山古人霊託』とその周辺," *Bungaku* 文学 36-10 (1968); also in *Chūsei bungaku no sekai* 中世文学の世界 (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 1972).

At the same time, Keisei viewed Hōnen, who performed the *senju nenbutsu*, as having fallen into Avīci hell (*Muken jigoku* 無間地獄) for slandering the true dharma—a place even worse than the Realm of Devils. His disciples Zen'nen 善念 and Shōshin 性信 are taken to have fallen there as well.²⁶ In other words, Keisei's judgment against *senju nenbutsu* was even more severe than Jien's. This extreme discrimination surely resulted from Keisei's religious stance, which was an elaboration of ideas inherited originally from Jien.

Keisei also devoted attention to the *Tengu's* appearance in order to appropriately deal with devils and vengeful spirits. His effort was, in particular, to understand *Tengu's* motivations, and then to overcome them through ascertaining their original good roots. It was said that people should avoid watching and seeing spectacles so as not to fall into *Tengu* trickery. Most of all, *Tengu* liked female *shirabyōshi* 白拍子 entertainers.

In particular, in this connection, we can make note that the account alluded here to cloistered emperor Go-Shirakawa's reputed madness over *imayō* 今様 ballads and various arts. It also, by implication, ascribes the origin of the Jōkyū War to Go-Toba's excessive favor for the *shirabyōshi* woman called Kamegiku (n.d.). In *Taiheiki* 太平記, it is claimed that the collapse of the Kamakura *bakufu* originated in Hōjō Takatoki's (1303-1333) extreme obsession with ritual dance (*dengaku* 田楽) performed in Shinto shrines and Buddhist temples. Moreover, at the so-called *Kanjin sarugaku* 勧進猿楽 dancing in Kyoto's Shijōgawara, the elevated stand fell, and this unexpected incident was taken to be a direct reflection of the violent times. This was the underlying theme of stories of *Tengu*, which often mentioned their hidden activities. It was said that *Tengu* often took as their mount a kite (*tobi* 鳶), and that if children killed the kite the *Tengu* would punish them. This kind of motif—*Tengu*, kite, and children who kill the kite—existed from early days. *Konjaku monogatari shū*, for example, included the story of Minamoto no Hikaru's discovery of a *Tengu*, which proceeded to transform itself into a kite but was soon after killed by boy attendants. Indeed, there is another story in the "Book of *Tengu*" about an intoxicated, wandering *Tengu* that was killed by impure boy attendants (*etadōji* 穢多童子).

Finally, the end of the dialogue depicts Keisei's inquiry as to how to prevent disasters caused by devils from harming himself and his resident temple Hokkesanji. The *Tengu* answered by quoting *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 摩訶止觀 (J. *Makashikan*): "In the mind of the Realm of Devils, innate Buddhahood exists, and that exists always and forever without changing itself. Thus, Chih-i (538-597) preached that the Realm of Devils and the realm of Buddha are one and the same." In response to Chih-i's statement, the *Tengu* bowed to Keisei's

²⁶ Nagai Giken 永井義憲, "Keisei Hitsuroku 'Hirasen kojū reitaku' ni tsuite – toku ni Hōnen, Zennen, Shōshin no da-jigoku no koto 『比良山古人霊託』について—とくに法然、善念、性信の墮地獄のこと," in Kushida Ryōkō Hakase koki kinenkai 櫛田良洪博士古希記念会, ed., *Kōsōden no kenkyū* 高僧伝の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin, 1973); *Nihon Bukkyō bungaku kenkyū daisanshū* (Shintensha, 1985).

collection of sacred scriptures and other treasures. Then he went his way happily but with lingering steps, demonstrating thereby his attainment of Buddhahood (*tokudatsu* 得脱).

The attitudes of Jien and Keisei who recognized the *Tengu* as devils form a contrast to each other. Jien reflected on the *Tengu*, surmising in his musings that they are the source of madness. On the other hand, Keisei confronted *Tengu* directly and, through dialogue with one, attempted to appropriate its mediating powers to draw out the words of oracles (*reitaku* 靈託). Keisei tried even to preach to the *Tengu*; in this regard, Jien throughout his life also attempted to hear the spiritual words from the world beyond death (*mei* 冥) which served to guide him. There were differences between Keisei and Jien, yet both of them perceived the emperor's "august spirit" (*goryō* 御霊)—vengeful spirit (*onryō*)—in the background of the existence of *Tengu* as their controlling force. Jien and Keisei attempted to locate the origin of chaos in the realm precisely there, and although they were both afraid, they made efforts to find a way to prevent such disorder's emergence. Here, their consciousness of the state—awareness of the royal law—came into being, transcending differences between their clerical stances, arising instead from realization of their responsibility.

At the same time, the "Book of Tengu" has no such fear or self-awareness. As discussed in Part Two of this study, the notion of royal law in the "Book of Tengu" is inserted into the descriptions in fascicles on the various temples rather than displayed openly in the narrative. However, representation of their recognition of *Tengu*/ devils which they inherited is consistent rather than merely fragmentary, rooted in the main theme and spread throughout the text. In the "Book of Tengu," a decisive gaze runs throughout the text that verifies the true relationship between *Tengu* and devils. Moreover, there are marks written on the illustration at points where *Tengu* and devils are represented; these marks are related to madness or deviation found in entertainment circles, or beliefs concerning the impurity of the body rooted in taboos (*kihikan* 忌避観, *imi* 忌み). In this fashion, we can interpret the "Book of Tengu" as a product of the spiritual *bricolage* of Jien and Keisei.

IV. Ruptures in the "Book of Tengu"

The "Book of Tengu" undertakes to portray the contemporary Buddhist image of the world systematically through the existence and role of *Tengu*. The realm is characterized by state Buddhism (*kokka bukkyō* 国家佛教) and a system of 'power blocs' of the Buddhist temples (*jiin kenmon* 寺院権門). Kuroda Toshio called it the exoteric-esoteric system (*kenmitsu taisei* 顯密体制).²⁷ Although the *kenmitsu* establishment criticized lineages of *nenbutsu* practice and of the Zen school that deviated from its views by labeling them heterodox, the *e-maki* includes such lineages into the system of order. They adopt the examples of

²⁷ Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄, *Nihon chūsei no kokka to bukkyō* 中世の国家と宗教 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1975); *Kuroda Toshio chosaku shū* 黒田俊雄著作集 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1995).

hosshin 發心 (aspiration for enlightenment) and *tonseitan* 遁世譚 and thus appropriate the notion of enlightenment (*tokudatsu*) to incorporate the heterodox lineages. The artist's brush of *e-maki* expresses its claims in the form of illustrations and *gachūshi* sometimes based on temple legends (*engi*), allowing each temple to claim its position, for instance; other times the *e-maki* takes some form of didactic or literary tale (*setsuwa* 説話/*monogatari-teki* 物語的), or a pedagogical method such as dialogue. By showing how *Tengu* achieved enlightenment, it also presents the principle of the identical nature of devil and Buddha (*mabutsu ichinyo* 魔佛一如). Emergent here is a playful inversion rather than a simple parody of Buddhist teachings: through the *Tengu*'s realization of his own evil, he is able to attain Buddhahood. Fundamentally, this development is a product of religious arts based on belief in the principle of "mad words and fictive phrases" (*kyōgen kigo* 狂言綺語).

Nonetheless, one cannot say that the principle of identity of devil and Buddha is fully actualized in the "Book of Tengu." There seem to be ruptures in this view which are portrayed vividly in the illustrations. The aspect of remorse, resulting from their realization of their own arrogance and of the obstinacy of various schools and various temples, is symbolized only in the form of *Tengu* who embody the transformation of a former monk. On the other hand, in cases such as those of Ippen and Jinen koji, their appearances, features, and manners are vividly illustrated, and it even presents a scene where they are accused of being *Tengu*—and an especially cold, insulting, vicious gaze is cast onto Ippen. This clearly stands aloof from the playful comical gaze directed to other *Tengu*. With this deliberate "discrimination," the *e-maki* expresses ruptures in society and the conflict between the cosmic view and human world-view. Even though society actively targets a specific group of people and attempts to remove them from its presence, it is clear here that society itself is ruptured and its views conflicted. This is to say, the world that created the "Book of Tengu" was disrupted, and thus it reflected or even prognosticated aspects of its social context. Around the time the "Book of Tengu" was made, the world as experienced was marked by contention and an impending season of violence.

The "Book of Tengu" illustrates retribution in response to the deliberations of the assemblies (*taishū kengi* 大衆建議) at Mt. Hiei and Miidera (Onjōji). There had historically been many struggles between the Sanmon and Jimon factions. The internal struggles in *Sanmon*, for example, later came to be recorded in *Gentoku ninen Hiesha Eizan Gyōkō ki* 元徳二年日吉社叡山行幸記 (Account of the Imperial Visit to Hie Shrine at Mt. Hiei in Gentoku 2 [1330]).²⁸

Starting in 1298 (Eijin 6), repeated murders, forced confinement, as well as fires perpetuated by armed bands (*akutō* 悪党), devastated Mt. Hiei. In this circumstance, Echin (1281-1356), who renounced the world by leaving Hiei and becoming a monk of the so-called perfect and sudden precepts (*endonkai no*

²⁸ Okami Masao Hakase Kanreki kinen kankōkai 岡見正男博士還暦記念刊行会, ed., *Muromachi gokoro: Chūsei bungaku shiryōshū* 室町ごろ : 中世文学資料集 (Tokyo: Kadokawa shoten, 1978; reproduction and annotation by Kawabata Zenmei).

rissō 円頓戒の律僧), came to be administrator (*bugyō* 奉行) for cloistered emperor Go-Daigo's pilgrimage to Mt. Hiei. Temples in Nara were in a similar situation. Conflicts over the succession of Kōfukuji constituted the seminal beginnings of what would become the so-called Nanto war (*nanto tōran* 南都闘乱), which began in 1293, and by 1295 it became a military conflict with cloistered emperor Go-Fukakusa's pilgrimage as a turning point.²⁹ The next year witnessed an "unspeakably strange matter" (*gongodōdan no chinji* 言語道断の椿事) concerning the lecturer (*kōji* 講師) of the *Yuima-e* service,³⁰ and soon the conflict went beyond the control of those who were first involved. Finally, in 1327 (Karyaku 2) there was a disastrous fire in Chūkondō Hall at Kōfukuji.³¹

The people who produced the "Book of Tengu," belonged to a world that was collapsing from within. Whether or not they were recluse-monks, they were in any event located within that world, and so it is apparent that they were compelled to find external enemies and create the *e-maki* even though they might have been aware of or involved in such complexities. Therefore, the "Book of Tengu" itself contains and exposes its own internal ruptures.

Finally, I would like to touch upon issues related to the establishment of the "Book of Tengu" that must be acknowledged—the issue of the audience for whom this *e-maki* was made. In other words, who were its intended readers, and in reality who read and when? Given the themes outlined by the *e-maki*, as well as the achievement of their large scale and consummation in the work, it is improbable that the *e-maki* was made solely as an example of frivolous art. It is likely that the author(s) intended a particular group of readers who would be able to understand the skillfully constructed claims expressed by the illustrations and words. This *e-maki* was not meant to be a device for educating the masses, nor was it created as an example of a traditional didactic tale *e-maki* (*setsuwa e-maki* 説話絵巻). Rather, the intended message incorporates the author's spiritual and political motivations which extended from, on the one hand, his direct involvement in the Buddhist law to, on the other, the aspect of royal law. Furthermore, I would like to suggest that the intended readers were in fact the retired emperors and emperors of the era, who stood at the apex of the royal law.

For instance, Emperor Hanazono 花園天皇³² who was born after the completion of the "Book of Tengu" wrote about his interests and his vast knowledge in Buddhism in his diary. In particular, he had quite a deep understanding of the study of the *Lotus sūtra* (*Hokke kyōgaku* 法華教学) of the

²⁹ Yasuda Jirō 安田次郎, "Einin no Nanto tōran 永仁の南都闘乱," *Ochanomizu shigaku* 御茶ノ水史学 30, 1987.

³⁰ Wakabayashi, "Tengu zōshi ni miru kyū bukkyō hihan – Kōfukujikan wo chūshin ni 天狗草紙にみる旧仏教批判—興福寺観を中心に."

³¹ Inaba Nobumichi 稲葉伸道, "Kamakura makki no Kōfukuji Daijōin monshu 鎌倉末期の興福寺大乗院門主," *Nenpō chūseishi kenkyū* 年報中世史研究 20 (1995); *Chūsei jūin no kenryoku kōzō* 中世寺院の権力構造 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1997).

³² Iwahashi Koyata 岩橋小弥太, *Hanazono Tennō* 花園天皇 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1962).

Tendai school. He recorded the dialogue at the Eight Imperial Lotus Lectures (*mihakkō* 御八講) in detail and left his own work on esoteric dharma transmission (*hōmon kuketsu* 法門口訣). Moreover, he received the *sokui* consecration of accession (*sokui kanjō* 即位灌頂) as well as other esoteric rites and initiations from illustrious Tendai monks. He was also interested in the precepts (*ritsu* 律) and in the practice of *nenbutsu*, and monks of different sects often came to confer the precepts on him and to preach the dharma on his behalf. Most of all, he was extremely fond of pictures and *e-maki*, and he often illustrated them himself. Therefore, one cannot deny the possibility that the “Book of Tengu” was produced on behalf of future emperors. It is not coincidental that Ken’a, one of the definite readers in the earliest era after its production, transcribed it and took it to the Kantō region because he had close relations with leaders of the Kamakura *bakufu*.

In fact, the “Book of Tengu” was later read by an emperor. According to *Kanmon nikki* 看聞日記 (Kanmon diary) by Prince Sadafusa 貞成親王 (1372-1456)—whose son became the emperor Go-Hanazono 御花園天皇 (1419-1470; r. 1428-1464)—the emperor examined the “Seven-Fascicle Seven Tengu Illustrations” in 1431 (Eikyō 3.4.17). Furthermore, the words on this *e-maki* came to be preserved in the Imperial court during the Muromachi period. In “Kinri Gozōsho Mokuroku 禁裏御蔵書目録” (The Catalog of the Document Treasury of the Imperial Palace) of *Higashiyama Gobunko kiroku* 東山御文庫記録 (The Record of Higashiyama Gobunko Archives)³³ there is a text called *Shichi tengu ekotoba (nobuhidekyō) issatsu* (“Single Volume of Illustrated Words of Seven Tengu [by Nobuhide]”). Although these works might be deemed only partial proof of textual reception and transmission, they also substantiate that the message mediated by such representations reached the imperial court and emperors near the end of the medieval era. It still, of course, remains a mystery as to how the message was received.

³³ Yamazaki Makoto 山崎誠, “Kinri gozōsho mokuroku kōshō 禁裏御蔵書目録考証 3,” *Chōsa kenkyū hōkoku* 調査研究報告 11 (Kokubungaku kenkyū shiryōkan bunken shiryōbu, 1990).